REMARKS

Claims 1-17 are pending in the present application, claim 17 having been added herein. The Office Action and cited references have been considered. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claim 7 was objected to as having an improper status identifier. Applicant's representative regrets the error. Applicant's representative submits that since no amendments are presented in the present paper to claim 7, the status identifier now properly reads "Previously Presented". If the Examiner maintains this objection, he is requested to contact the undersigned to indicate what the appropriate correction is believed to be.

Claim 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. The language "possibly" has been removed, and the subject matter has been added to new claim 17. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-4 and 9-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,658573 to Bischof. Claims 5 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Bischof in view of Montgomery (U.S. Patent No. 7,127,605). Claims 5 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Bischof in view of Montgomery and de Jong (U.S. Patent No. 7,130,549). These rejections are respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

Claim 1 recites a method for controlling access to data handled by references in a system for executing programs, the programs including processes and tasks, wherein upon executing a program, the method comprises the steps of 1) having

3the system store an entire set of references which the program obtains by means

considered as licit, the program comprising code from a single Java Card package; 2)

before any operation intended to be forbidden in case the operation deals with values

which are not licit references, having the system check that the values are among the

licit references which have been stored for this program, and 3) accepting the operation,

responsive to the step of checking, when the checking determines the values are

among the licit references, and rejecting the operation responsive to the step of

checking, when said checking determines the values are not among the licit references.

This is not taught, disclosed or made obvious by the prior art of record.

Bischof refers to the protection of resources in a distributed computer

system. In particular, Bischof refers to the use of an interception manager and guard

objects attached to the object references in order to control access to the objects.

However, Bischof does not describe a storage of a set of references.

Indeed, the Examiner refers to column 6, l.13-24 and 44-62, column 9,

l.39-54, the term "Java library", column 12, l.52-63 and column 13, l.41-54 to question

the novelty of the storage of a set of references. The only reference to a storage in

these paragraphs corresponds to the Java Library.

However, the Java library refers to a collection of defined functions or

classes for use in a program as defined in column 4, l.1-2 and not to a collection of

references. As a consequence, the feature corresponding to the step of having the

system store an entire set of references is not disclosed in Bischof.

Claim 1 is therefore new with respect to Bischof. As said feature is not disclosed nor suggested in the other cited documents, claim 1 is new with respect to the cited documents.

Furthermore, storing an entire set of references which the program obtains by means considered as licit allows afterwards checking the licit status of encountered reference and therefore enhance protection of data handled by references so that claim 1 is inventive.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is patentable over the prior art of record. Claims 2-17 are believed to be patentable in and of themselves, and as they depend from and include the limitations of claim 1 which is patentable for the reasons discussed above.

In view of the above amendment and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections of record. Applicant submits that the application is in condition for allowance and early notice to this effect is most earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner has any questions, he is invited to contact the undersigned at 202-628-5197.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

By   /Ronni S. Jillions/
     Ronni S. Jillions
     Registration No. 31,979

RSJ:me
Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197
Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528
G:\BN\G\Gema\Leroy4\Pto\2011-01-06Amendment.doc